



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/403,560	01/12/2000	TAKUYA NISHIMURA	MAT-V07839	7444
7590	07/23/2004		EXAMINER	
LAWRENCE E ASHERY RATNER & PRESTIA ONE WESTLAKES BERWYN SUITE 301 PO BOX 980 VALLEY FORGE, PA 194820980			SMITHERS, MATTHEW	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2137
				DATE MAILED: 07/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/403,560	NISHIMURA ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Matthew B Smithers	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 and 16-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 and 16-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see paper No. 8, filed 10 May 2004, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-11 and 16-20 under 102(e) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of U.S. patent 5,706,348 granted to Gray et al.

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file. Specifically, the English translation of the Japanese priority document was received on May 10, 2004 and has been placed in the file.

Claim Objections

Claims 6-10 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. More specifically, claims 6-10 are multiple dependent claims with claims 16 and 17 as one of their

dependencies. According to MPEP 608.01(n)B.2., a multiple dependent claim must refer back to a preceding claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 19 refers back to multiple dependent claim 10 and claim 20 refers back to multiple dependent claim 11. All multiple dependent claims incorporate the limitations or elements of the claims they depend from and forms a set of alternative embodiments of the claimed invention. As such any subsequent multiple dependent claim that refer back to a first multiple dependent claim take on the limitations or elements of each of the alternatives formed from the first multiple dependent claim. This type of situation creates multiple alternative sets from the single alternative sets formed by the first multiple dependent claim and as such causes the claims to be indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the scope of the subject matter applicant regards as their invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-11 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 6,028,933 granted to Heer et al.

Regarding claim 1, Heer meets the claimed limitations as follows:

"A method for transferring data on a bus system using both isochronous communication and asynchronous communication; said isochronous communication is for any device on the bus to receive synchronous data; said asynchronous communication is for a predetermined device to receive asynchronous data; said synchronous data capable of containing actual data and encryption identification information indicating encrypted actual data; and encrypted actual data is decrypted using decrypting information obtained through the following steps:

a) receiving said synchronous data at a receiving device, and said receiving device via said asynchronous communication requesting decrypting information for said

actual data from a sending device sending said synchronous data, if said encryption identification indicates encrypted actual data;

b) receiving said request at said sending device and said sending device sending one of:

- i) encrypted decrypting information of said actual data; and
- ii) decrypting information data for obtaining said decrypting information, to said receiving device via said asynchronous communication; and

c) executing at said receiving device one of:

- i) extracting said decrypting information from said encrypted decrypting information; and
- ii) obtaining said decrypting information using said decrypting information data." see column 7, line 44 to column 8, line 39 and column 25, line 66 to column 26, line 48.

Regarding claim 2, Heer meets the claimed limitations as follows:

"The method for transferring data as defined in Claim 1, wherein a plurality of procedures are available between the steps of detecting encrypted actual data and obtaining said decrypting information by said receiving device receiving said synchronous data; and said receiving device executes the following steps for obtaining said decrypting information before requesting said decrypting information:

- i) querying said sending device of types of procedures executable by said sending device before requesting said decrypting information;

ii) selecting a procedure from those executable by both said sending device and receiving device; and

iii) obtaining said decrypting information in accordance with said selected procedure." see column 7, line 44 to column 8, line 39 and column 25, line 66 to column 26, line 48.

Regarding claim 3, Heer meets the claimed limitations as follows:

"The method for transferring data as defined in Claim 2, wherein a procedure is selected in accordance with a predetermined priority when there are a plurality of procedures executable by both of said sending device and said receiving device." see column 7, line 44 to column 8, line 39; column 25, line 66 to column 26, line 48.

Regarding claim 4, Heer meets the claimed limitations as follows:

"The method for transferring data as defined in Claim 1, wherein a plurality of procedures are available between the steps of detecting encrypted actual data and obtaining said decrypting information by said receiving device receiving said synchronous data; and said receiving device executes the following steps for obtaining said decrypting information:

- i) starting a procedure selected from said plurality of procedures in accordance with a predetermined priority;
- ii) re-selecting said procedures one-by-one until a procedure executable by said sending device is found; and

iii) obtaining said decrypting information in accordance with the selected procedure executable by said sending device." see column 7, line 44 to column 8, line 39 and column 25, line 66 to column 26, line 48.

Regarding claim 5, Heer meets the claimed limitations as follows:

"The method for transferring data as defined in claim 2, wherein said asynchronous data transmitted between said sending device and said receiving device in accordance with said selected procedure contains an identifier for indicating the type of said procedure executed." see column 7, line 44 to column 8, line 39 and column 25, line 66 to column 26, line 48.

Regarding claim 6, Heer meets the claimed limitations as follows:

"The method for transferring data as defined in one of Claims 1 to 5, 16 and 17, wherein said receiving device authenticates whether said sending device is an authorized sending device before making a request for said decrypting information." see column 29, line 15 to column 33, line 42.

Regarding claim 7, Heer meets the claimed limitations as follows:

"The method for transferring data as defined in one of Claims 1 to 5, 16 and 17, wherein said sending device receiving a request for said decrypting information authenticates that said receiving device is an authorized receiving device before sending encrypted decrypting information of said actual data." see column 29, line 15 to column 33, line 42.

Regarding claim 8, Heer meets the claimed limitations as follows:

"The method for transferring data as defined in one of Claims 1 to 5, 16 and 17, wherein said sending device and said receiving device are authenticated as authorized devices

before said receiving device makes a request for said decrypting information." see column 29, line 15 to column 33, line 42.

Regarding claim 9, Heer meets the claimed limitations as follows:

"The method for transferring data as defined in one of Claims 1 to 5, 16 and 17, wherein the following steps are executed before said receiving device makes a request for said decrypting information:

i) said receiving device sending information required by said sending device at least for establishing a common key with said sending device; and

ii) said sending device sending information required by said receiving device at least for establishing said common key with said receiving device; and said sending device encrypting said decrypting information using said common key and sending said encrypted decrypting information; and said receiving device extracting said decrypting information from said encrypted decrypting information received using said encryption key." see column 26, line 49 to column 27, line 59.

Regarding claim 10, Heer meets the claimed limitations as follows:

"The method of transferring data as defined in one of claims 1 to 5, wherein only said actual data is encrypted." see column 7, lines 57-60.

Regarding claim 11, Heer meets the claimed limitations as follows:

"The method for transferring data as defined in one of Claims 1 to 5, 16 and 17, wherein said sending device includes a signal source for said actual data and determines encryption of said actual data in a fixed length unit which is output from said signal source; and said sending device places encrypted actual data and non-encrypted actual

data in different output units of said synchronous communication, and then outputs them to said bus system." see column 7, lines 44-60.

Regarding claim 16, Heer meets the claimed limitations as follows:

"The method for transferring data as defined in Claim 3, wherein said asynchronous data transmitted between said sending device and said receiving device in accordance with said selected procedure contains an identifier for indicating the type of said procedure executed." see column 7, line 44 to column 8, line 39; column 25, line 66 to column 26, line 48.

Regarding claim 17, Heer meets the claimed limitations as follows:

"The method for transferring data as defined in Claim 4, wherein said asynchronous data transmitted between said sending device and said receiving device in accordance with said selected procedure contains an identifier for indicating the type of said procedure executed." see column 7, line 44 to column 8, line 39 and column 25, line 66 to column 26, line 48.

Regarding claim 18, Heer meets the claimed limitations as follows:

"The method for transferring data as defined in claims 1 to 5, 16 and 17, wherein said receiving device authenticates whether said sending device is an authorized sending device before making a request for said decrypting information." see column 29, line 15 to column 33, line 42.

Regarding claim 19, Heer meets the claimed limitations as follows:

"The method for transferring data as defined in Claim 10, wherein the following steps are executed before said receiving device makes a request for said decrypting information:

- i) said receiving device sending information required by said sending device at least for establishing a common key with said sending device; and
- ii) said sending device sending information required by said receiving device at least for establishing said common key with said receiving device; and said sending device encrypting said decrypting information using said common key and sending said encrypted decrypting information; and said receiving device extracting said decrypting information from said encrypted decrypting information received using said common encryption key." see column 7, line 44 to column 8, line 39 and column 25, line 65 to column 26, line 48.

Regarding claim 20, Heer meets the claimed limitations as follows:

"The method for transferring data as defined in Claim 11, wherein the following steps are executed before said receiving device makes a request for said decrypting information:

- i) said receiving device sending information required by said sending device at least for establishing a common key with said sending device; and
- ii) said sending device sending information required by said receiving device at least for establishing said common key with said receiving device; and said sending device encrypting said decrypting information using said common key and sending said encrypted decrypting information; and said receiving device extracting said decrypting

information from said encrypted decrypting information received using said common encryption key." see column 7, line 44 to column 8, line 39 and column 25, line 65 to column 26, line 48.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A. Gray et al (US 5,706,348) discloses marker packets for synchronization of encrypted communications in a network.


B. Doshi et al (US 6,041,051) discloses a method for multiple access services using an adaptive access protocol.

C. Doshi et al (US 6,349,138) discloses an apparatus for scrambled digital transmissions.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew B Smithers whose telephone number is (703) 308-9293. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (9:00-5:30) EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew T Caldwell can be reached on (703) 306-3036. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Matthew B Smithers
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2137